UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Thursday, 12 November 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. SUH (Vice-Chairman)	(Republic of Korea)

CONTENTS

- Action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61834 0092V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.32
18 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 65, 68 AND 142 (continued)

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2 - draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.11, L.19 and L.40 - and cluster 3 - draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.22, L.25, L.29 and L.35.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions to which I have referred, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call first on the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

Significant and important developments are taking place in the world today. The cold war is behind us. There is a new spirit of cooperation, which has renewed the hope and expectations of the international community. Yet, against the backdrop of these major changes, which provide us with hope for real peace and disarmament, we see a recrudescence of tensions as a result of regional problems which have remained unresolved over a long period.

Global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other, and should be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security. Hence the increasing importance and relevance of our proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. The sponsors believe that the shared goal of universal nuclear disarmament would receive an impetus from the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

zones are not an end in themselves, but, rather, a complement to the global and comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament. They also serve as a vital confidence-building measure in the context of regional disarmament.

The importance of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world has been recognized by the General Assembly, at its tenth special session, as well as by the non-aligned countries, at their tenth Summit, held in Jakarta earlier this year.

We are of the firm view that the requisite conditions exist in South Asia to enable the countries of the region to move towards the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. All the countries of the region share the commitment to keep the area free of nuclear weapons. They have all made unilateral declarations at the highest levels, pledging themselves not to acquire, develop or manufacture nuclear weapons. It is now time to move forward. The draft resolution has been prepared on the same lines as resolution 46/31, adopted by an overwhelming majority last year, with the inclusion of two new preambular paragraphs.

The seventh preambular paragraph takes note of the proposal to hold consultations among five nations with a view to ensuring nuclear non-proliferation in the region. The eighth preambular paragraph considers that the eventual participation of other States as appropriate in this process could be useful.

It is our sincere hope that the international community will lend its broad support once again to the draft resolution. We also hope that adoption of this draft resolution by an overwhelming majority will provide further impetus and encouragement to the States in our region to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Mr. EKWALL (Sweden): My delegation is aware that the Committee should this afternoon take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". However, we would propose that action upon it be postponed until later in the afternoon, after action on draft resolutions in cluster 3.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has been informed by several delegations that they would prefer that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 be taken up later during the meeting. As a general rule, the decision regarding taking action on one draft resolution after another should be adhered to, and I am extremely reluctant to accept the postponement of action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 until later in the meeting. I do not feel that we should do that, but, since several delegations have requested it, we can take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 after action on other draft resolutions. But I would not entertain such a procedure again, because it is contrary to what we have already decided.

I call on the representative of Sri Lanka to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): On behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I have the honour to present draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

The draft resolution is based on the discussions this year in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. It has also taken into account the views expressed in the Final Document of the Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Jakarta in September this year.

In its preambular paragraphs, the draft resolution recalls the historical process of the efforts to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

In the fifth preambular paragraph the draft resolution welcomes the positive developments in international political relations which offer opportunities for enhancing peace, security and cooperation, and expresses the hope that the new spirit of international cooperation will be reflected in the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee to that end.

There is an awareness that further meaningful steps must be taken if the goal of a zone of peace is to be realized. These steps must be taken with the full and active participation of all concerned: the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean region, the major maritime users and the permanent members of the Security Council.

In operative paragraph 1 the draft resolution takes note of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

In operative paragraph 2 the Ad Hoc Committee is requested to conrider new alternative approaches to achieving the goal of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 reflect the views expressed in the Final Document of the Non-Aligned Summit Conference held in Jakarta, to which the Chairman reported at the request of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Operative paragraph 6 requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold a session during 1993, with a duration of ten working days and with the possibility of holding another session of five working days, if necessary. However, after further consultations, it has been agreed that operative paragraph 6 should be amended to read as follows:

"Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold a session during 1993, with a duration of not more than ten working days".

I should explain why it was thought necessary to have the Ad Hoc Committee meet for this length of time. The Ad Hoc Committee intends to address the complex issues involved and the differing perception of these issues, as well as its own future role. This task would be greatly facilitated if there was a genuine dialogue involving the littoral and hinterland States of the Ad Hoc Committee, the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean. In view of the important work involved in setting out new alternative approaches and addressing complex issues, it is imperative that the Ad Hoc Committee should be given adequate time to fulfil its tasks.

We call upon all members which are presently not participating in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee to rejoin its work.

In the spirit of cooperation that exists today, on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement I urge the First Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31 without a vote. Further, if member States which have withdrawn from participating in the Ad Hoc Committee returned and worked

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

collectively towards the new alternative approaches, the efforts that have been made this year to seek new directions would not have been in vain.

Before I conclude my introduction of the draft resolution, I wish to thank all members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their kind cooperation and support. I also wish to thank the members of the secretariat for their valuable assistance in completing our work in the Ad Hoc Committee.

I commend draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31, as amended, for the consideration of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions listed in cluster 2, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 28th meeting, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Egypt and Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we shall take draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 27th meeting, on 9 November 1992, and was sponsored by the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of Israel, who wishes to explain the position of his delegation with respect to the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11.

Mr. YATIV (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, as it has on similar draft resolutions over the years. I wish to remind the members of the Committee of our reservations with respect to the modalities mentioned in the draft resolution and to reiterate those which we believe are essential: direct negotiations and mutually agreed-upon verification arrangements.

Furthermore, in the last year States in the region have joined the peace process, including the multilateral talks, where regional security and arms-control issues will be discussed in due course, following prior agreement by all countries of the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolutions in cluster 3; we shall take action today on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.22, L.25, L.29 and L.35.

I call first on the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the privilege, on behalf of its 79 sponsors, of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35, "Regional disarmament".

Since its inception, the United Nations has provided a focal point for the international community in its efforts to promote the maintenance of international peace and security through disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the promotion of international cooperation in diverse fields. At the very beginning, disarmament emerged as a major factor in the achievement of global peace and security. On the contemporary global scene, characterized by the end of the cold war, disarmament stands at the heart of all efforts to further the goal of international peace and security.

The recent far-reaching agreements between the United States and the Russian Federation, which will result in drastic reductions in their strategic nuclear arsenals, have had a highly salutary effect on the international security environment and represent major progress towards nuclear disarmament.

We all agree that a global response to disarmament must continue to be pursued sincerely. Simultaneously with global efforts, it is important that collective efforts be made by all countries at the regional level to promote disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and confidence-building measures wherever and whenever possible. These measures must, of course, take into account the specific characteristics of each region and be adopted with the free agreement of the States concerned.

There is ever-growing recognition in the world today that many of the security problems and preoccupations of States can be accorded fuller consideration in the regional context, where remedial measures suitable to specific regional conditions can be designed.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

The success of the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), which resulted in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, bears testimony to the idea that regional consultations offer the best and most realistic answers to many of the problems of security and arms control.

The declaration issued at the conclusion of the Tenth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held at Jakarta in September this year, commended the regional approach.

There have been important positive developments in the regional approach to disarmament in various regions. It is in that context that the arms-control and disarmament proposals made recently, including those made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the President of Egypt, hold special importance for the South Asian and Middle East regions. We are also encouraged by the progress in this regard in Latin America and in other regions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35, which is on the same lines as last year's resolution 46/36 I, has equal relevance and applicability to all regions now and in the future. It complements existing global efforts and agreements, and in no way undermines any of them. We hope the draft resolution, which enjoys wide sponsorship and whose analogue was adopted last year by an overwhelming majority, will gain even wider support this year.

The CHAIRMAN: In our consideration of cluster 3, we turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22, "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 9 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25, "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands,

(Mr. Kheradi)

New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29, "Confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 9 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, the Russian Federation, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35, "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 12 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Italy, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, the Federated States of Micronesia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, the Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Bhutan, Cuba, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.* **

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

** Subsequently the delegation of Ireland informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain the Cuban delegation's position on two draft resolutions, one in cluster 2 and the other in cluster 3.

We should like first to state our position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40, introduced by the Mexican delegation on behalf of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, concerning the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The Cuban delegation joined in the consensus on the draft resolution since we believe that it serves the purposes that Mexico and the other Latin American and Caribbean countries have always advocated by establishing the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean and its two additional protocols. The Treaty reaffirms our peace-loving tradition and rejection of nuclear weapons and our desire that our part of the world should become a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

As members are aware, Cuba is not a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, although we fully share the just aspirations of the countries and peoples of the region.

We asked last year to be granted permanent observer status in the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL), and as a result of a unanimous decision of that body we have been participating in its activities. In asking for observer status we were primarily guided by the spirit of Latin Americanism and as part of the Caribbean and because we feel that the matters that have prevented our full adherence to the Treaty are not sufficient to separate us from the region of which we are an inseparable part - politically, historically and geographically.

The spirit that led the Latin American and Caribbean countries to support the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and to favour making Latin

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

America and the Caribbean a nuclear-weapon-free zone for Cuba's commitment at the First Ibero-American Summit, to the effect that although all of Cuba's reasons for not signing the Treaty of Tlatelolco, when all the countries of Latin America assumed the Treaty responsibilities, were still valid, Cuba would be prepared to sign as well, for the sake of regional unity. The amendment of the Treaty, which took place on 26 August, undoubtedly brings us closer to the time when all the Latin American and Caribbean countries will be full parties to the Treaty.

We would have preferred to see in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution a fuller reflection of our position, which the representative of Mexico explained when he introduced the draft resolution on 9 November.

Turning now to the draft resolutions in cluster 3, on regional disarmament, my delegation notes with satisfaction the efforts made by the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 on regional disarmament. The introduction of a set of ideas that our delegation regards as important allows us to support the draft resolution.

Nevertheless, we were not able to support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 on regional disarmament, because it omitted certain ideas that we consider to be important.

We hope that in future sessions they will be included in draft resolutions on regional disarmament, if it is not possible to have a single, combined draft resolution on the subject.

In that connection, we believe that regional disarmament provisions should include a reference to the need for measures to help eliminate the possibility of surprise attacks and large-scale offensive manoeuvres. All the States of a region should take part in the adoption of such measures.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

Peaceful political solutions to conflicts should be sought; such means would contribute to relaxing tensions and creating a climate of trust that would make it possible to adopt effective regional disarmament measures. Regional initiatives should have the support of all the countries of the region concerned and of certain States outside the region; such countries with military installations or bases in the region should take part in regional disarmament negotiations with a view to including those installations in the negotiating process.

Those are the basic reasons why our delegation was obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 on regional disarmament.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I should like to explain why we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35. India has been generally supportive of proposals submitted in the United Nations on confidence-building measures and viable acceptable regional disarmament ideas and proposals which emanate, after due consultations and on a voluntary and mutually agreed basis, from all concerned States of a region, proposals which take into account the regional characteristics. This is evident from the fact that India joined in the consensus achieved in relation to draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.25, A/C.1/47/L.2, A/C.1/47/L.29 and A/C.1/47/L.24 and is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22.

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 does not fall into this category. It has eschewed a consensual approach, and has ignored the fact that the consent of all concerned States is an essential prerequisite for any meaningful regional or subregional disarmament. The draft resolution also lacks focus and precision. For one thing, while singling out nuclear non-proliferation, it ignores other weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

In our view, therefore, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 is flawed and tends to distort the concept of regional disarmament. It is for this reason that my delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now move on to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. As no delegations have expressed the wish to make a statement other than in explanation of their vote, I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): India wishes to place on record its views on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. The draft resolution is virtually the same as General Assembly resolution 46/31 of 6 December 1991. Its thrust has not in fact changed in the more than 16 years since a resolution on the subject was first introduced. India has expressed its reservations on the idea repeatedly and forcefully. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, as it has done on similar draft resolutions on several occasions in the past.

India's position on this subject is well known and principled. Nuclear disarmament is a global issue, and one which can only be solved globally. The goal of nuclear disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament cannot be achieved by partial measures. We do not consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones to be fully in accord with this global approach. In fact, the global reach of nuclear weapons and their deployment and stationing in different parts of the world render nuclear-weapon-free zones less than effective in promoting global nuclear disarmament.

My delegation is aware that the United Nations has endorsed nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world. It is however necessary to remember that the United Nations endorsed them only after a proper definition of the region, based on a correct perception of the geographical extent, and after taking into account the full range of the security concerns of the States involved had been arrived at.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Prior consultations among the States involved and their full participation are some of the prerequisites of any regional arrangement. Where these prerequisites are lacking, where there is an artificial definition of a region, and where no consensus exists, United Nations endorsement would not be appropriate. My delegation is unaware of efforts by the sponsors to undertake prior consultations among all the States concerned nor has any consensus been achieved for establishing any nuclear-weapon-free zone in the geographical region of India's security concerns. It is against this backdrop that my delegation will therefore once again vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". This year, France decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on this subject for the following reasons.

First, by doing so France would be showing its support for all the efforts made in the struggle against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It has already clearly demonstrated its commitment in this regard at the global level by adhering to the non-proliferation Treaty in particular and by accepting the rules of full-scope safeguards as a condition for our exports of nuclear materials, and at the regional level by adhering to Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Secondly, France considers that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones plays a particularly important role as regards the imperatives of non-proliferation. However, the agreement of all the States concerned is, for France, a precondition for the establishment of such zones.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Thirdly, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia would contribute significantly to strengthening peace and security both in the region and at the global level. We note with interest that in the seventh preambular paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note

"of the proposal to hold consultations among five nations with a view to ensuring nuclear non-proliferation in the region"

and would consider

"that the eventual participation of other States as appropriate in this process could be useful".

France for its part would be happy to make a contribution to this process. Indeed, as a nuclear Power it has repeatedly stated that it is ready to grant safeguards of the non-use of nuclear weapons or threat of their use, according to modalities to be determined, to States that would form part of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Lastly, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia should be preceded by regional measures likely to promote a climate of confidence and transparency among all States in the region. The process of talks between India and Pakistan seems to us an encouraging step in that direction.

We hope that the support of the international community will promote progress towards agreement among all the States in the region for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegations wish to speak we shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 32nd meeting of the Committee on 12 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Myanmar, Viet Nam, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 was adopted by 117 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States delegation again this year joined in support of the draft resolution on establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. In this connection, we would like to make two points in explanation of the United States vote.

First, we trust that all States in the region will take particular note of operative paragraph 2, which urges that all the States of South Asia, while

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

working to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, refrain from actions contrary to that objective.

Secondly, our delegation also wishes to note that our support for the resolution should not be interpreted as an endorsement of nuclear-weapon-free zones on a universal basis, as some might infer from the text of the third preambular paragraph.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): I wish to take this opportunity to explain Japan's vote on some of the draft resolutions in cluster 2 on which we have taken a decision.

Japan joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 and voted in favor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. We believe that the denuclearization of the region will contribute to the promotion of peace and stability in this region and in the world as well. Japan supports the efforts made by the countries concerned with a view to realizing denuclearization of the region, and urges the countries that have not yet done so to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty as soon as possible.

Ms. SKYMOEN (Norway): I should like to explain Norway's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". My country found it possible to vote favourably on this draft resolution. We support the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones as one of the means to bring about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, provided that all States in the region are involved. Adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty is an option to this end that is immediately available to all.

Mr. PELAEZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

(Mr. Pelaez, Argentina)

The non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a priority of the international community. That is logical, since these weapons present a concrete and serious threat to the very survival of mankind. Latin America was the first region of the world to combat the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Treaty of Tlatelolco is a historic landmark as the first international instrument banning nuclear weapons. My Government's recent decision to ratify the Treaty, as amended, clearly demonstrates our support for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a prior step towards the elimination of such weapons at the international level. For this reason, my country supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other areas of the world, and we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19.

Mr. JUSUF (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which we have just adopted.

The Indonesian position on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. Together with other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), it continues efforts to promote the establishment of South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In that document, the General Assembly declared:

> "The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of ... arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the zone concerned ... constitute[s] an important disarmament measure." (resolution S-10/2, para. 33)

(Mr. Jusuf, Indonesia)

The General Assembly further stated:

"The process of establishing such zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged.... The States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements establishing the zones". (resolution S-10/2, para. 61)

As efforts to achieve an agreement have yet to be concluded, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19.

The CHAIRMAN: I have received a number of requests to speak in exercise of the right of reply. We shall follow the same procedures as outlined earlier.

Mr. YAMTOMO (Indonesia): As may be recalled, the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia came into force in 1976. The signatories to this historic Treaty were the regional members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). It contained provisions for accession by any Government accepted as a new member of ASEAN. Accordingly, Brunei Darussalam later became a signatory.

The Manila Summit meeting of ASEAN adopted a further provision to enable any State in South-East Asia to accede to the Treaty without becoming a member of ASEAN. In this context, we were gratified by the accession of Viet Nam and Laos to the Treaty. These developments in our view constituted important modalities through which to foster confidence, mutual understanding and cooperation between the regional States, especially after decades of strife and turmoil.

As can be seen, both the original intent of the Treaty and the developments associated with it are to promote regional cooperation and solidarity without undue outside interference or intervention. It is in the same spirit that members of ASEAN decided to sponsor a draft resolution with a view to seeking international recognition and support, and thereby to promote the Treaty's objectives. It is significant that this initiative has received the sponsorship of an overwhelming majority of member States.

To our dismay and disappointment, however, the delegations of Portugal and Cape Verde have given a one-sided and self-serving interpretation of the Treaty and taken yet another opportunity to malign Indonesia. My delegation is baffled by their motives in intervening in the debate to attempt to

(Mr. Yamtomo, Indonesia)

introduce extraneous issues which have nothing to do with the draft resolution under consideration. There are other forums where it might be appropriate to discuss and consider such issues, yet for their own reasons those delegations sought to utilize the First Committee and distract its attention from its mandate of dealing with disarmament, international security and related issues.

This deplorable attitude on the part of Portugal and Cape Verde is part of an aggressive but futile campaign against Indonesia carried on in every forum and at every opportunity. It is incredible to witness Portugal and its former colony engaging in such a negative campaign and manoeuvre while claiming that they support the efforts of the Secretary-General to resume the tripartite talks on East Timor, which will indeed resume next month. The obvious consequence of such an attitude is not only to make for sourness and undermine the sanctity of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia and the significance of the draft resolution for the States in the region, and for the international community as a whole, but also adversely to affect the prospects of a successful dialogue under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

My delegation therefore categorically rejects references to the so-called question of East Timor.

The climate for considering the multitude of issues in this Committee has greatly improved. Our debates have become more purposeful, constantly seeking wider areas of agreement. Against this backdrop we should not permit any intervention that would be a blemish on the Committee's credible record.

Mr. JEK (Singapore): I wish to reply to the explanation of vote given by the delegation of Portugal this morning on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia".

When my delegation, on behalf of the sponsors of that draft resolution, introduced it on Tuesday, 10 November, we clearly stated that the Treaty had been acceded to by nine countries in the region and provided a framework for cooperation in many fields for the Parties to the Treaty. The States Parties to the Treaty have decided to have the principles and purposes of the Treaty endorsed by the United Nations, because of the importance of a closer relationship between the Organization and regional organizations, as advocated by the Secretary-General in his report, "An Agenda for Peace". The support of Member States of the United Nations for this simple and straightforward objective and for the Treaty is evidenced by the large company of sponsors and by the fact that the draft resolution was adopted by consensus.

The statement by the representative of Portugal this morning on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 involves an issue which in my delegation's view ought not to have been raised in the Committee in connection with the adoption of this draft resolution, whose sole aim is to endorse the principles and purposes of the Treaty. We view with regret the statement by the delegation of Portugal, which appears to call into question the principles and purposes of the Treaty.

Ms. AHMAD (Brunei Darussalam): My delegation would like to express its satisfaction over the wide sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, which was adopted by consensus this morning. The objective of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and other sponsors of the draft resolution was to seek United Nations endorsement of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation

(Ms. Ahmad, Brunei Darussalam)

in South-East Asia. The Treaty is aimed at promoting lasting peace and cooperation in the region. To us this is consistent with the call made by the Secretary-General in "An Agenda for Peace", when he urged regional organizations to play their respective roles in regional confidence-building as part of preventive diplomacy and peace-building.

I therefore join my ASEAN colleagues in stating my delegation's disappointment at the views expressed by Portugal and another delegation, which in our view are not in line with the prevailing international mood, in which the Treaty was overwhelmingly endorsed. The matter raised by Portugal is therefore a non-issue and has no relevance whatsoever to the issue.

Mr. ZAINAL ABIDIN (Malaysia): On the day that Malaysia and the other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) - together with Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Papua New Guinea - rejoice over the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, we regret the uncalled-for move by the Portuguese delegation and others to raise a matter that has nothing to do with the Treaty.

Malaysia, the other members of ASEAN and the other countries of the region have come to seek United Nations endorsement of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, as the Treaty and the constructive ASEAN regional cooperation that have been the hallmark of the success of the region are in line with the current international climate of international peace and cooperation, and consistent with the increasing support for confidence-building measures, including those in the recent report of the Secretary-General, "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

The Treaty provides a strong foundation for peace and regional cooperation in the region. The decision of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic to accede to the Treaty in July this year marks an important stage in the progress of efforts to strengthen peace and cooperation in the region. The ASEAN countries and our neighbours are determined to move towards the goal of achieving greater economic growth and social development through regional cooperation as well as cooperation with our dialogue partners and others.

Malaysia supports the continuing effort of Indonesia to settle differences with Portugal in talks being held under the auspices of the Secretary-General. In that light, the Portuguese delegation should not have raised the matter here.

Mr. DE LEON (Philippines): I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24. As one of the lead sponsors of that draft resolution, on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, and as an original Treaty signatory, the Philippines is very gratified that the initiative of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has been sponsored by an overwhelming number of States - 137, to be exact - from all regional groups, and that the Committee adopted it without a vote.

The sole aim of the draft resolution is, as everyone in the Committee knows, to endorse the purposes and principles of the Treaty. Therefore, the Philippine delegation wishes to express its disappointment and regret that a matter which it considers extraneous to the draft resolution and outside the Committee's agenda was introduced after the draft resolution's adoption.

Ms. SANTIPITAKS (Thailand): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia", which the First Committee adopted by consensus this morning, aims to seek cognizance from the United Nations of the Treaty's principles and purposes. My delegation believes that the principles embodied in the Treaty and its provisions for the pacific settlement of disputes provide a strong foundation for regional confidence-building measures, which we hope will not only promote regional stability, but also enhance international security as a whole.

On the issue raised this morning by the representative of Portugal, my delegation feels that this is neither the time nor the place for this question to be raised. While the issue was included in the provisional agenda of the current session, the General Assembly has already decided to defer consideration of the item to the next General Assembly session. My delegation notes with satisfaction that the dialogue between the parties under the

(Ms. Santipitaks, Thailand)

auspices of the Secretary-General will be resumed next month. We hope that this question will be resolved through negotiations and dialogue.

Mr. NUNES (Portugal): I will be brief on this matter. I would like to start by recalling what we said earlier this morning. We welcome - and I emphasize that we welcome - the celebration of this kind of treaty. Portugal has never stated anything whatsoever against the spirit or the wording of the Treaty.

But, as all of us know, a Treaty is not only a group of principles; it also has to be followed by the countries that sign it. This was one of the objections that we thought we might raise at this particular moment and in this Committee. As one country spoke of "bad faith" shown by Portugal in introducing this matter here today, allow me to recall the words of the Portuguese Foreign Minister in his statement at the beginning of this session of the General Assembly, when he clearly stated:

> "Portugal, in its capacity as administering Power recognized by the United Nations, presented to the Secretary-General last January a proposal for a dialogue, without preconditions and under his auspices, with Indonesia and all the parties directly involved".

Let me emphasize that it was Portugal that asked for this renewal of dialogue. He added:

> "The objective is a just, comprehensive, and internationally acceptable solution, with full respect for the legitimate interests of the East Timorese people, including the right to self-determination, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and international law". (A/47/PV.7, p. 118)

Mr. BARBOSA (Cape Verde) (interpretation from French): Very briefly, at this stage in our discussion my delegation would like to say two things. First, it offers its unshakeable support for the goals of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia. Secondly, it believes that the Treaty will bring peace and well-being to all the peoples in the region. That is why we supported the draft resolution, while recognizing that all the signatories to the Treaty should do everything in their power to ensure that peace benefits all the peoples of the region.

We welcome the negotiations between Portugal and Indonesia concerning United Nations mediation.

Mr. YAMTOMO (Indonesia): I listened attentively to the statements that have just been made by the representatives of Portugal and Cape Verde. My delegation has already responded to the statements made by Portugal and Cape Verde on the draft resolution concerning the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation. We called them wholly inappropriate and indeed unwarranted. This is particularly so in the context of introducing issues that have nothing to do with the mandate of the First Committee.

There is certainly a new spirit of cooperation and compromise on issues that have long been considered to be contentious. It should be said, to the credit of members, that differences between them are being increasingly submerged in the larger, collective interests of the global community. Under these circumstances it is particularly inappropriate to introduce divisive elements. My delegation remains hopeful that in the future the delegations concerned will refrain from such interventions so that the Committee can focus on its agenda item.

Mr. NUNES (Portugal): I shall be even more brief in my second intervention in exercise of the right of reply.

I would just like to say to all the countries represented here that Portugal feels and thinks, like the large majority of the Assembly, that the right to self-determination and conditions in East Timor are matters for a regional approach; they do not allow that part of the region to live in peace and stability. Therefore, we believe that in dealing with this item we are in the proper forum in which to address the issue.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
33rd meeting
held on
Friday, 13 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)

CONTENTS

- Action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.33
29 December 1992

ENGLISH

92-61846 2765V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142 (continued)

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.12, L.17, L.33, L.36, L.37 and L.41. Action on the other draft resolutions in this cluster - either because of consultations or for other reasons - has been postponed until next Monday.

Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on these draft resolutions in cluster 4, I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): I wish to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, under agenda item 54, and entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". The draft resolution is sponsored by 91 countries, the 66 which are already listed in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 and the following: Antigua and Barbuda, Bulgaria, Cuba, Egypt, Germany, Guyana, Italy, Kazakhstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zaire and Zambia.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

The sponsors of the draft resolution would like to intrcduce the following oral amendment. In the eleventh preambular paragraph, which begins "Noting the concerns expressed", we would delete the words from "and, in this context," to "26 October 1991", that is to say, the words "and in this context, welcoming the statement of the Russian Federation when announcing its nuclear-testing moratorium decision on 26 October 1991", and then continue "which noted, inter alia, the environmental benefits and economic savings to be derived" and add the words "from a comprehensive test ban on nuclear testing".

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): It gives me great pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution is sponsored by Bangladesh, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

Over the years we have expressed deep concern at the threat caused to non-nuclear-weapon States by the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapon States. Obviously, the most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would lie in their complete elimination. However, until this objective is realized, the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with a legally binding assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in order to address their security concerns.

In our view, security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be without qualification, not subject to divergent interpretation, and unlimited in scope, application and duration. In the propitious climate that prevails today with the end of the cold war, there can be no reason why such assurances cannot be extended to the non-nuclear-weapon States unconditionally and in a legally binding manner. This is an idea whose time has now come.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 was prepared along the same lines as General Assembly resolution 46/32, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority in favour with only two abstentions.

The draft resolution reaffirms the urgent need for reaching an agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It appeals to all States to work actively towards an early agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula that could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

We hope that it will enjoy the widest support of the Committee.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

The draft resolution is presented on behalf of the sponsors, bearing in mind the demand of a vast majority of the international community that, in the improved international climate, all efforts should be exerted towards the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world and complete nuclear disarmament. As a step towards the attainment of this goal, it calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations to conclude an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

The considerations behind the draft resolution were spelled out by my delegation when introducing it earlier at the current session. A legal agreement prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons would help bring about a qualitative change in security doctrines and policies based on nuclear weapons and lead to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Such a draft resolution enjoyed wide support at previous sessions of the General Assembly, and it is our hope that it will continue to attract wide support, so as to express the sentiment that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons remains a priority goal of the international community.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the position of the French delegation on draft resolutions A/C.47/L.37, L.12 and L.17.

My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", for the following reasons.

Because France is a nuclear-weapon State, which opted for a strategy of deterrence based on the possession of independent nuclear forces maintained at a strict level of sufficiency, it has always been guided by two imperatives: on the one hand, the need to contribute to the struggle against the spread of nuclear weapons and to support the efforts of the international community towards disarmament; and, on the other, the obligation to ensure its security, and thus the continuity of its policy of deterrence, with the constraints that this implies, including as regards testing.

(Mr. Errera, France)

It is this twofold imperative that led the French Government to take, this year, the following initiatives regarding the issue of nuclear testing. On 8 April France announced its decision to suspend its nuclear testing until the end of 1992. At the same time, we indicated that France would participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament. On 23 September, in the General Assembly, the French Minister of State for Foreign Affairs expressed the hope that we would act

"so as progressively to reduce the number and power such experiments." (A/47/PV.8, p. 31)".

Finally, on 3 November, our Foreign Minister proposed that the representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament initiate a process of common reflection on the issue of nuclear testing.

Those various initiatives illustrate a twofold will on our part. The first is a will of restraint, which France has always demonstrated in carrying out its deterrence policy and which, even recently, it manifested by reducing some of its nuclear-weapon programmes. We note with satisfaction that our initiatives regarding nuclear testing have fostered a dynamic process. This finds its expression today in unilateral measures of restraint adopted by most nuclear-weapon States, which thereby show their willingness to take into account the changing international situation. Secondly, there is our will to engage in dialogue with the non-nuclear-weapon States as well as with the nuclear Powers. Indeed if this issue is to be dealt with, an effort by the whole international community is required. It is also a fact that the five nuclear-weapon States have a particular role to play in this area.

That is why, in our view, the time has come to initiate a process of common reflection on the issue of nuclear testing by the representatives of

(Mr. Errera, France)

the five nuclear-weapon States at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. They are in the best position to do that. This will not be negotiation; it will be a process of consultation that takes into account the situation resulting from recent unilateral initiatives.

These consultations will be carried out without prejudice to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament. France expresses the hope that this work, to which we attach great importance, will be resumed at the beginning of next year and will benefit from the convergence of the unilateral initiatives of several nuclear Powers. Indeed, we believe that the dialogue between the nuclear Powers and the dialogue with the non-nuclear-weapon States are not mutually exclusive but should reinforce each other. It is in this spirit that France has put forward its proposal.

Those are the considerations that led my delegation to change its vote this year on this draft resolution. Our attitude will continue to be inspired by a sense of responsibility towards the international community, particularly bearing in mind the important 1995 deadline regarding the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; by a sense of responsibility for our own national security, which prevents us from ignoring existing instabilities and nuclear capabilities in Europe; and by a sense of responsibility in the search for acceptable solutions that simultaneously exclude the temptation to immobility and take account of the complexity of the issue of nuclear testing.

I should like now to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12; "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes".

This year France decided, for several reasons, to abstain in the vote on the text submitted to the First Committee.

(Mr. Errera, France)

First, by changing its vote, France wished to underscore that it shares the international community's concern about the future of the fissionable material released by the implementation of the disarmament agreements concluded by the two main nuclear-weapon Powers, as well as about the risks of the dissemination of such material that the break-up of the Soviet Union could entail.

The change in our position should also be interpreted in the light of the recent initiatives taken by France in the areas of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, in the framework of its arms-control and disarmament plan of 3 June 1991: the accession to the non-proliferation Treaty; the adoption of full-scope safeguards as a condition for peaceful nuclear exports; the ratification of Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Treaty of Tlatelolco; the discontinuance or slowing down of some nuclear-weapon programmes; and the suspension of nuclear testing for 1992 and the proposal for common reflection by the representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on the issue of nuclear testing.

All these initiatives are inspired by France's same policy of restraint, and they demonstrate in a concrete way an attitude of openness and a readiness for international dialogue on all measures likely to contribute effectively to disarmament and non-proliferation.

Consequently, France would not object to the initiation of discussions at the Conference on Disarmament on the issue of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. However, owing to the current state of international security, the adoption of concrete measures of a global character does not seems feasible at this stage.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Furthermore, France notes that at the regional level the prohibition of the production and importing of fissionable material for the manufacture of nuclear explosive devices has been proposed as a possible measure of non-proliferation, particularly in the Middle East. By changing its vote, France wishes to encourage discussion of such measures by the parties concerned and demonstrates its recognition of the contribution that those parties could make to regional disarmament.

Lastly, I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Last year, at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, my delegation explained why it had changed from abstention to an affirmative positive vote on Pakistan's draft resolution regarding negative security assurances. On the one hand, the text of the draft resolution had been improved following our proposed amendment; on the other hand, France wanted its affirmative vote to be interpreted both as encouragement to progress in the ongoing negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on negative security assurances and as confirmation of its commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Errera, France)

This year, for the same reasons, France reiterates its support for the draft resolution introduced by Pakistan. In addition, since last year France and China have acceded to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). As many delegations stressed in the general debate, the fact that the five nuclear-weapon States are parties to the NPT creates a new situation which could foster progress on, inter alia, the issue of security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States. Moreover, the fact that this question no longer arises in the same terms as during the cold war would justify its reappraisal in the light of the new international situation.

Like the other nuclear-weapon States, France has already undertaken solemn commitments regarding the non-use or non-threat of use of its nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. But it also attaches importance to a multilateral solution of this problem which would be both equitable and effective. That is why it contributed to the work of the Conference on Disarmament by supporting an approach based on the following elements.

First, until nuclear disarmament is universal, it is legitimate for the States which have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons to obtain from nuclear-weapon States assurances against the use or threat of use of such weapons against them.

Secondly, with regard to the form of such an assurance, it is also legitimate that the States which renounce the possession of nuclear weapons by implementing a legally binding and verifiable instrument should expect, in return, legally binding assurances from nuclear-weapon States. It is this concept of mutual legal commitments by nuclear and non-nuclear States that is already at the basis of regional denuclearization agreements such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Thirdly, a legally binding commitment to non-acquisition of nuclear weapons can take several forms. The main one is the non-proliferation Treaty, which provides for the implementation of full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It could also be a regional denuclearization agreement, such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, providing for either a regional verification regime or IAEA safeguards. It could also be a safeguards agreement concluded directly with IAEA, providing for acceptance of non-nuclear-weapon status and the application of full-scope safeguards.

As international experience has shown, it is not enough for a State to be a party to a treaty; it must also scrupulously abide by its commitments under the treaty - hence the importance of adequate verification regimes and of strengthening them as necessary. In any event, in regard to the benefit of legally binding negative security assurances, it would not be normal to put on an equal footing the overwhelming majority of States which accept and comply with non-proliferation commitments and the States that refuse to comply with them or violate them.

When it acceded to the NPT, France indicated that it intended to participate actively in the preparations for the 1995 Conference, which will be crucial for the future of the non-proliferation regime. We consider that progress on the issue of negative security assurances in the direction I have indicated would be an important element for the success of that Conference. That is why France will spare no effort, in particular at the Conference on Disarmament, to contribute to such progress.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom has decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as it did in the past on the relevant draft resolution. We do this because the text does not refer clearly to the necessary relationship between a security assurance given by a nuclear-weapon State and the necessity for a binding commitment from recipient States on nuclear non-proliferation, preferably through adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

This relationship is spelt out in our unilateral declaration on security assurances, which is referred to in the draft resolution. The United Kingdom has, however, repeatedly stressed its willingness to continue to consider ways and means to achieve effective international arrangements. We shall continue to negotiate in good faith on this issue at the Conference on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will vote first on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 24th meeting, on 3 November 1992, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: France, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently, the delegations of Latvia and Peru advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Colombia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Lao Pecple's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded voto was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 was adopted by 97 votes to 21, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 as orally amended.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", as orally amended this morning by the representative of Mexico, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 24th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Slovenia, the Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: China, France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, as orally amended, was adopted by 136 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the last draft resolution scheduled for this morning's meeting, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1992. It is

sponsored by the following countries: Bolivia, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, China, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Sweden, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41 was adopted by 92 votes to 18, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded voting on the draft resolutions presented for adoption this morning. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on those draft resolutions.

Mrs. LAOSE-AJAYI (Nigeria): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on A/C.1/47/L.17, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

We voted for the draft resolution this year, as we did for similar draft resolutions in the past, because Nigeria is a non-nuclear-weapon State that should benefit from the provision of such security arrangements. We would, however, like to point out that the present international situation is auspicious for the conclusion of an effective international arrangement in this regard. My delegation therefore calls upon all States to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty to ensure their unequivocal status as non-nuclear-weapon States and to enable them to be in a position to benefit from such an assurance.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria): I wish to explain Bulgaria's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.17, L.33 and L.41.

As in previous years, my delegation voted this year for the draft resolution - A/C.1/47/L.17 - dealing with so-called negative security assurances. Our vote reflects our continuing support for the general concept of legally binding assurances by nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

However, we continue to have very serious doubts whether the submission of the same, virtually unaltered draft resolution on this issue at a time of radical changes in the international security environment can serve any practical purpose in terms of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States or enhancing the non-proliferation regime. The General Assembly has been adopting virtually the same resolution for 15 years already, with no

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

visible effect on the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. As one of the countries which voted in favour of the draft resolution, we firmly believe it is high time to change it by orienting it towards options that seem more likely to achieve progress in the new world situation.

In view of the positions held, and adopting a purely pragmatic approach, we feel that there are now real prospects of positive progress on negative security assurances, mainly in the context of preparations for the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) extension conference in 1995. It is a great pity, therefore, that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 did not seek to place, as a first step, the search for an agreement on a common approach, and in particular on a common formula, in the context of the extremely wide circle of non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the NPT or other equally binding arrangements ensuring a non-nuclear-weapon status.

All nuclear-weapon States have now joined the NPT, which is a very important factor for building the prerequisites of progress. Initial differences of perception, due to the confrontation between blocs of cold war times, are also being overcome, and this process will probably continue in the context of the NPT. Bulgaria therefore strongly favours a change in the approach of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17, which seems to be the preferred course of action by many other States belonging to various regional groups, as seen in today's explanations of vote by the delegations of France, Nigeria, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Bulgaria. Those familiar with the history of the negative security assurances negotiations are aware that all those countries have made a very positive input to preparations for progress on this important issue.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

Turning now to the other two draft resolutions, I wish to state that Bulgaria was unable to support draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.33, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" and A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze", on the grounds that they lack the degree of pragmatism needed in the new security environment.*

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

Bulgaria supports the general thrust and objectives of the two draft resolutions. The means of pursuing these objectives, however, seem more applicable to the old cold war times; the situation is now totally changed. The concept of a freeze at a time of agreement on a more than 70 per cent reduction in the nuclear stockpiles of the major nuclear Powers is simply outdated.

On some of the elements of the definition of a freeze used in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, we see great merit in following a separate course of action, which is being done in other draft resolutions, some of which my country sponsors. Other elements of the freeze seem either to be in the making or no longer to be topical.

On draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, my delegation decided to change the vote it cast last year, because it sees in it no interest in taking into account the serious reservations that a number of delegations expressed on a similar draft resolution at the forty-sixth session.

We wish to reaffirm our consistent support for and commitment to the principle of non-use of nuclear weapons. This principle will be fully implemented in the context of a process leading to the complete elimination of these weapons and to making the non-proliferation regime truly universal. At the same time, we realize that the calls for negotiations on a convention to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons contained in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 and its previous versions have not led to any progress, and there seems to be little chance that they will in the foreseeable future - anyway, not in the radical manner suggested by draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

It was for those pragmatic reasons that Bulgaria voted against draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.33 and A/C.1/47/L.41.

Mr. RICHARDS (New Zealand): I wish to explain our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze" and A/C.1/47/L.17, on so-called negative security assurances.

On the nuclear-arms freeze, I should like to recall that the representative of New Zealand commented on this occasion last year that the concept of a freeze might well have had some beneficial effects at a time when the nuclear-arms race was in progress, but that as we were even by then witnessing the reversal of the arms race it was our view that a freeze was an idea whose time had passed. Since then even more remarkable progress in achieving a reduction in nuclear armaments has been made. While the draft resolution's preambular paragraphs acknowledge this progress, the operative paragraphs seem themselves to have become subject to a freeze. My delegation regrets that a text having its origins so very much in another era is still being submitted to the Committee. That is why New Zealand abstained on the draft resolution. We very much hope that next year the Committee will not have to spend time giving consideration to outmoded concepts such as that proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41.

I turn to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17. I am taking the draft resolutions out of order because I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of Australia as well as New Zealand.

Australia and New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 concerning the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of threat of use of nuclear weapons, or, put more simply, negative security assurances. In

(Mr. Richards, New Zealand)

our view, it cannot be contested that non-nuclear-weapon States should receive effective assurances from nuclear-weapon States that nuclear weapons will not be used or threatened to be used against them.

The other side of this coin, however, is that reasonably to expect to receive such assurances non-nuclear-weapon States must make a clear and unambiguous commitment to the non-nuclear cause by acceding to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) and other relevant regional non-proliferation accords, like the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga. Accordingly, our delegations would have preferred this aspect - the importance of binding non-proliferation commitments by non-nuclear-weapon States - to be reflected in the text of the draft resolution. We do not think that the issue of negative security assurances can be considered in isolation from broader efforts to strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. We would therefore encourage the sponsors of this text to reflect further on this aspect when preparing future draft resolutions on this subject.

As we approach the 1995 extension conference for the non-proliferation Treaty, we are optimistic that new opportunities will be available for resolving the negative security assurance debate to the satisfaction of all Parties to the NPT. In the preparations for the 1995 conference, we look forward to considering proposals in this area which build on the greatly improved international environment and the increased climate of confidence that pervades international relations between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): The United States wishes to explain its vote on two draft resolutions.

I begin with draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". The United States

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

traditionally abstained on votes on such draft resolutions in the past; last year, however, it was compelled for the first time to vote against the draft resolution since it attempted - in our view, prematurely - to initiate activity on the issue in the Conference on Disarmament. The United States Government, as part of President Bush's non-proliferation initiative, announced earlier this year that it would not produce plutonium or highly enriched uranium for nuclear explosive purposes. United States policy on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes has thus fundamentally changed. The United States continues, however, to oppose multilateral action on this issue at this time. For this reason, the United States abstained on the draft resolution today.

The United States delegation did not support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", because in our view it is not consistent with United States policy in respect of nuclear testing limitations. The United States has been required by recent legislation to suspend all nuclear tests temporarily until well into next year. On 10 July President Bush announced that future United States nuclear tests would be conducted only to evaluate and to improve the safety of its much smaller nuclear deterrent, and to maintain the reliability of United States nuclear forces. In this regard, the United States will conduct only the minimum number of tests necessary for these purposes.

However, during the period in which the testing is suspended the United States will reflect on its future requirements in terms both of the minimal programme needed to maintain safety and reliability and of the relationship of a minimal testing programme to the future of a modest nuclear deterrent. While the need for nuclear testing has been dramatically reduced over the last

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

several years, in conjunction with fundamental changes in the international security environment and deep reductions in nuclear forces, it is our belief that a modest need remains, and in all candour is likely to continue into the future, as long as a modest stabilizing deterrent is required.

The United States remains prepared to discuss all aspects of nuclear testing issues in the Conference on Disarmament, to agree to the establishment of an ad hoc committee on a nuclear test ban under an appropriate mandate and to participate constructively in the work of such a committee.

Mr. SERGEEV (Russian Federation)(interpretation from Russian): We wish to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". As with similar draft resolutions in the past, the Russian delegation has supported draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons, and we wish to remind the Committee that under the earlier conditions of global nuclear confrontation, when there were no large-scale measures to reduce or eliminate nuclear weapons, we regarded this proposal as one of the measures that could contribute to progress in nuclear disarmament.

In recent years, however, the situation has changed greatly. We are witnessing fundamental changes in the general nature of international relations which also touch directly on the sphere of nuclear disarmament. In our view, at a time when a process of radical reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons is evolving, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 should adopt an approach that is more realistic and takes account of the changes that have occurred; otherwise at the next session our delegation will be compelled to review its attitude towards the draft resolution.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): My delegation wishes to express its views on two draft resolutions, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12 entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes" and draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

My delegation was constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12, and I should like to set out the reasons therefor. The Final Document adopted by consensus in 1978 at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament clearly sets out in paragraph 16 the stages for the process of nuclear disarmament. We recognize that the intent

(Mr. Chandra, India)

behind the draft resolution is laudable. However, the partial approach it represents is not in conformity with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which correctly sets the issue in its totality.

We believe that there should be a simultaneous stoppage in the production of nuclear weapons and all fissionable material for weapons purposes. Only with such a total approach can we introduce a universal, equitable and non-discriminatory system of international safeguards on all our nuclear facilities. In our view, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/47/L.41 on this subject is far more in conformity with the goals set out in the Final Document.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, we wish to compliment the sponsors on having made every effort to generate support for the draft resolution. The objective of achieving a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests is a long-standing priority for us. It was clearly reiterated in the preamble to the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution is, however, without prejudice to our well-known position on the scope of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, as visualized in the preamble to the partial test-ban Treaty.

India had the honour to chair the 1991 Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban in the Conference on Disarmament and to act as Special Coordinator for this item in 1992. Despite every effort on our part and the cooperation of many delegations, the lack of an adequate negotiating mandate was a handicap. We hope that when the Ad Hoc Committee is re-established in 1993, as called

(Mr. Chandra, India)

for in the draft resolution, it will have an adequate negotiating mandate. Meanwhile my delegation invites all nuclear-weapon States to replicate unreservedly the unilateral moratoriums on nuclear-weapon tests announced by some nuclear-weapon States in order to create a propitious atmosphere for those negotiations.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China)(interpretation from Chinese): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33. The Chinese Government has all along stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and has, since the first day of its possession of nuclear weapons, undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances and committed itself to not using, nor threatening to use, nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States can make the same commitment unconditionally and reach a corresponding international agreement as soon as possible, thereby providing a forceful impetus to the process of nuclear disarmament. We hope that China's constructive initiative will receive a positive response.

On the basis of the above-mentioned position of principle, the Chinese delegation is in favour of the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and at the same time wishes to point out that certain elements of the draft resolution and the draft convention annexed to it need to be improved.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): I wish to explain Australia's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.33 and A/C.1/47/L.41.

Australia was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33 on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, which has just been adopted by the

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Committee. Australia feels that the draft resolution relates to an outdated concept which is a hangover from the days of the cold war. The idea of a convention banning the use of nuclear weapons continues to pose difficulties and would not, we believe, provide a solution to the problem it seeks to address. It is for the reason that Australia has once again voted against the draft resolution.

We note, however, that the end of the cold war has brought about changes in attitude towards the possible use of nuclear weapons and that substantial progress in nuclear disarmament has been achieved over the past year in particular. Australia continues to give its full support to all such efforts.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze", Australia has once again abstained. We have done so essentially because we do not believe that it takes full account of the important progress in nuclear disarmament that has taken place, including, in particular, the progress over the last twelve months. In view of this progress, we see the concept of a nuclear-arms freeze as being somewhat anachronistic. However, Australia strongly supports all measures to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race, including measures towards the achievement of nuclear-arms reductions, a comprehensive test ban and a cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

Ukraine joined in the consensus on this draft resolution in order to express its support for the progress that has recently been noted in this field. At the same time, my delegation would like to point out that the title of the draft resolution and, more important, its substance, do not fully reflect the essence of the ongoing nuclear-weapons reduction process, nor does it pay due tribute to the contribution of some newly independent States to that process.

Our second observation concerns the range of States that should be involved in the process. We feel strongly that other nuclear States which until recently preferred to take the position of passive onlookers in the process of reduction of nuclear weapons must have their share and their say in unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts. Nowadays we cannot see any valid excuse for any of the known nuclear-weapon States to abstain from the process of negotiated steps leading to the reduction of existing nuclear forces.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

For this reason we ask the sponsors of the draft resolution to find appropriate language to ensure the active participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the ongoing process of reduction of nuclear weapons.

Mr. VASILYEV (Belarus) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of Belarus wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze".

We supported the draft resolution as a matter of principle. Along with the positive aspects of the draft resolution, there are also provisions which undermine certain other draft resolutions that are now under consideration in the Committee.

It seems to us that the draft resolution does not take full account of the progress made in the area of nuclear disarmament in recent times. Some of the provisions are not entirely realistic. We would urge the sponsors of the draft resolution to take account of these circumstances in future and thereby substantially change the draft resolution. Otherwise, my delegation will be obliged to review its position on this text.

Mr. KIBIDI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Zaire did not this time vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1 47/L.41, "Nuclear-arms freeze". My delegation feels that substantial progress has been made in this area and that the draft resolution does not adequately reflect those efforts. For this reason, my delegation abstained in the voting.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.